PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS.

BEING PROBLEMS FOR CONSIDERATION
AT THE PAN-ANGLICAN CONGRESS, 1908.

MARRIAGE.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

S. A. Groups 1 & 2. Price 2d.

THE CHURCH AND HUMAN SOCIETY.

CONTENTS.

MARRIAGE.

* *These Papers were not received when this cover was sent to press, January* 29, 1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

SANCTITY OF MARRIAGE AS THE BASIS OF HUMAN SOCIETY

(IN CHRISTIAN LANDS)

By REV. J. H. F. PEILE

The subject of Christian Marriage, whether we reverence it as a Sacrament, or are content to view it merely as a state of life allowed in the Scriptures, is one which above others needs wary walking. On the one hand it is hedged about by weighty sanctions of Canon and Civil Law, and fenced in with the still more ominous Tapu of immemorial custom. It savours of presumption to discuss as an open question what the wisdom of our forefathers has settled once for all. Moreover it is further obscured for our instinct, if not for our intellect, by the Manichean theories of Asceticism which have never lost their hold on Christian thought. On the other hand it involves at once the largest social problems, and the most intimate personal sentiment;—sentiment which is partly silly and even prurient and safely to be dismissed without consideration; but much more of it also so sacred, that even to speak of it is, in some measure, to encroach upon the inviolable privacy, not of the family only, but of the individual soul.

Therefore to treat such a subject with authority requires a profound and sympathetic knowledge of the social conditions and inner lives of men in other times, classes and countries, as well as our own; to speak of it with sincerity and acceptance demands a habit of mind finely tempered of frankness and delicacy;—and a power of exact and noble expression which is the peculiar heritage of the poet.

It follows then that I must renounce the hope of expressing my meaning in a manner which will cause it to be gladly received by all who hear me. I must be content with sincerity; and for that I ask a hearing, patient, and as sincere as I shall try to make my utterance.

If we are to do any good, we must try to set aside our prejudices, our likes and dislikes, and to recognize loyally what is known of the facts of social and individual life which are concerned with and influenced by marriage; and further we must be scrupulously honest in our efforts to ascertain what is the real and essential teaching of Christianity. That is the condition on which we can hope that our discussion of such a subject as this will issue in wise and fruitful counsels.

1. It appears convenient, in the first place, to formulate, and, if necessary to criticize, the Canon which we intend to apply in our judgement of the facts, and in our practical conclusions. Viewed in

one aspect, the appointed task of Christianity has been to de-orientalize marriage. Let me pause for a moment on the phrase and explain exactly what it is intended to convey.

The Oriental conception of marriage treats woman not as a person at all, but as a chattel, held in absolute ownership by her lord, and valued chiefly for physical qualities. She is perhaps the best of a man's possessions, but ranks with *them* and not with him, as we can see in the text of the Tenth Commandment. Our sensibilities are naturally shocked by a crude statement of this view of the marital relation; but the spirit of it is not without influence to this day on the thought of the Western world. Greek poetry, it is true, offers us a nobler ideal of womanhood, but it is not in marriage that it finds its highest and most characteristic expression. In its consummate achievement, the *Antigone* of Sophocles, a sister's devotion, not the love of a wife, is the mainspring of the tragedy. And without dwelling on those darker aspects of Greek civilization which kept Woman from her rightful place, we may note in passing that the conception of romantic love, between man and woman, which, however fantastic and distorted, still regards Woman as an entity in her own right, first emerges with Meleager of Gadara in the last century before Christ, long after the classic period had closed.

In republican Rome the bride passed from the *manus*, the possession, of her father, into the *manus* of her husband; and, although in later days Roman women enjoyed a full measure of emancipation, it was at the cost of the dissolution of morals and the break-up of family life.

The Teutonic nations had from the first a wiser and juster view of the position of women. But the conditions of society during the long ages of the growth of civilization, gave a preponderating value to the qualities in which men admittedly excel—physical strength, courage, and energy—and the Civil Law, unchallenged by the religious feeling of the time, sanctioned and endorsed the implied comparison. A woman, unless she could vindicate her right by exceptional gifts, was viewed and treated as a pawn in the game of politics and property.

In the present day, while some of us cling to the old fallacy, we are confronted by a different, but, as it seems to me, an equally perilous misconception of the facts. With the advance of civilization, and increased security of life, the mediaeval theory has broken down. The English law of property has at last recognized a woman's right to her own possessions. Women demand, and are winning, full rights to their own labour, and their own intellectual endowments. In a protected and orderly Society they prepare to meet Man on his own ground, and claim, not only equality, but identity of function in the social organization. At the beginning of the twentieth century in England, Man and Woman are in process of becoming, no longer owner and chattel, no longer master and slave, but competitors in the struggle for life.

The true natural relation which it is the business of Christianity to present and maintain is very different. There can be no com-

parison, in the strict sense of the word, between beings not rival but complementary; each possessing qualities which are not found in the other, but are just those which are needed to give effect to the hitherto potential qualities of its correlative. Physically this is a truism. And in the sphere of emotion it is partly recognized; that is, it is admitted in the case of passion; but it is not always fully recognized with regard to that more sober and permanent marital affection, which is a higher power of friendship and comradeship. Before, however, we can arrive at a just conception of Christian marriage, that is, marriage in accordance with the whole law of our nature, this complementary relation must be extended to the whole realm of being, which has not forgotten that it was made in the image of God.

Such a marriage as this will be a free and equal compact, based upon instinctive and reasonable attraction, which is the outer and visible sign of an inner mutual need, and a mutual power of help and completion, valid for all the elements in the being of the chosen partner, body, soul, and spirit; a compact, therefore, which is permanent, not for convenience only, or by the law of man, but in its essence, because it touches things which are not subject to the limitations of place and time.

2. Now if the general enforcement of this ideal of marriage has been the appointed task of Christianity, it must be admitted that Christianity has, owing to various hindrances, advanced so slowly, and achieved so imperfectly, that it is still possible for a hostile critic to say that "Christian doctrine exhibits the same contempt for Women which all Oriental religions manifest", without being instantly refuted by the common sense and experience of mankind. In other words, the Church, the Christian society, has not understood fully, and carried out faithfully our Lord's teaching on this most important of social questions. It follows therefore that we are bound to distinguish sharply between Christ's own teaching and the decrees of any ecclesiastical authority, even the precepts of so early and loyal a follower as St. Paul. The thoughts of St. Paul on this subject are never quite free from the prevailing Oriental ideas of his time; and he is further influenced by an almost Essenian asceticism which leads him in one place[1] to speak of marriage as a sort of permitted concubinage, a mere concession to human frailty: "it is better to marry than to burn." It is comforting to find that in another, and a later Epistle,[2] he rises to the conception of marriage as a "great mystery"; that is, very much what is meant by a Sacrament in the wider sense of the term. But he never reaches the level of Christ's teaching, and never quite escapes from the notion of a comparison in which Man proves to be the superior.

The essence of Christ's general teaching is to insist on the value of each human soul, as a member of God's family. The result of His teaching on marriage is to raise Woman from the position of a chattel to that of a person, who brings to her union with Man

[1] 1 Cor. vii. [2] Eph. v. 32.

a different but equivalent personality, and thereby to exalt marriage from a merely physical union to one that is truly social, and more than social, spiritual and ideal.

This high doctrine, as we are ready to admit, involves monogamy. The store of service and affection which the husband owes is rightly claimed by one, it cannot be divided or scattered. But it involves also the permanence of the obligation of the marriage tie during life. The limitations of time which apply properly to secular contracts can have no relation to the spiritual covenant of marriage. "He answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female? . . . Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."[1]

But in this matter we are not left to inference. In striking contrast with the usual tenour of Our Lord's teaching on social questions, which is general, and deals more with character than with specific acts, His pronouncement on this point is absolute and explicit: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."[2] Divorce followed by re-marriage is a breach of the Seventh Commandment. I am taking it for granted that the true form of Our Lord's utterance is found in St. Mark and St. Luke[3]: the prohibition is absolute, without the single excepted case which is given in the text of Matthew, in words which are now generally rejected by critics; and whose interpolation may reasonably be accounted for, like the relaxation of the law of Moses, as a concession to the hardness of men's hearts. It is impossible for me here to go into the arguments for and against the genuineness of this much debated clause; but, to my mind, the question is settled by the protest of the disciples in Matt. xix. 10. "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is good not to marry," a protest which could never have been extorted from them by an interpretation of the Jewish Law of Marriage with which they were perfectly familiar.[4] We are bound therefore, I think, as Christians, to accept the prohibition as absolute. Undeniably it sometimes involves hardship for innocent persons; but in that it does not stand alone in our experience of life; and, on the other hand, it does not prohibit the separation in external things of husband and wife, when gradual estrangement of sympathies, or the degeneration of one party to the compact, has made continued union a torment to the other, and a danger to the children; nor does it forbid law and public opinion to extend their protection to the sufferer in an ill-assorted marriage.

3. It is important, however, to remember that, absolute or qualified, the prohibition does not constitute the whole, or the more important side of Our Lord's teaching upon the sanctity and obligation of family

[1] Matt. xix. 4. [2] Mark x. 11, 12. [3] Luke xvi. 18.

[4] On the whole question see the notes on Matt. v. 32 and xix. 9, in Allen's St. Matthew, *International Critical Commentary*.

life. The question of divorce, urgent as it unquestionably is at the present time, may easily be given a prominence which is disproportionate, and actually militates against its sensible and permanent solution. It is no reasonable policy to attack, directly and separately, what is only a symptom of a deep-seated moral disorder, unless we endeavour at the same time to cure, or better still to prevent the malady itself, the false and trivial conception of marriage and family life. It is the office of the Church to impress upon the mind of the human race such a conception of these sacred things, that people will not dare or desire to deal lightly with them. For us as Christians the motive to this reverence will be found abundantly in the teaching of Our Lord. By precept and example He makes family life in the fullest sense a Sacrament; itself, by God's mercy, common to the use of all men,

> not too bright and good
> for human nature's daily food:

yet, like the Bread and Wine, seen by wiser eyes as a miracle, a miracle of natural growth and fitness for its purpose; and typifying the highest and most lifegiving truth that can be known; even that the Eternal and Omnipotent God is a Father; and we, frail and imperfect creatures, men and women, not His playthings or His slaves, but His children. A sincere and reverent contemplation of the words and life of Christ will guard us from the temptation to disparage either the affections or the discipline of the Home.

All that we know of the youth and early manhood of the incarnate Son of God is contained in a few verses of St. Luke's Gospel. But the reticence of the inspired Evangelist is more significant than the trite fantasies of the uncanonical gospels: for his sparing words, and his silence, alike reveal to us the mystery, that the wisdom, which could already astonish learned age, must still be schooled and trained by the sweet daily ministrations of family intercourse and loving obedience; and that not for nothing did He who was to be the Redeemer of a world, dwell long years pent in the narrow circle of a Galilean village household. And when the time came, and He passed for ever from that humble, well-loved threshold, its memories were still about Him to the end of His earthly life. Even in the mortal agony of the Cross, His thoughts turned to her of whose pangs He was born a man; whose tender love had shielded His weakness, and ministered to His childish wants; to her who, as mothers must, had felt the sword pierce through her own heart also, as she watched Him grow beyond her shielding care, beyond her power of help and understanding.

Everywhere too, His teaching repeats and emphasizes the lesson of His life; not only in the great passages upon the Fatherhood of God; but also in the choice of a little child as a pattern to all who would enter upon the first stages of the Christian life; in the picture of the prodigal remembering his father's house, and returning thither, not to be repulsed; in the illuminating words which remind us that it is not pattern parents only who can do more for their children

than a stranger can—"If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children." And finally, even in that stern warning, sometimes perversely misinterpreted; "He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me;" He speaks of the ties of blood and marriage, not as things to be lightly cast away, but as ranking with the very life itself, and yet to be sacrificed, if need be, for Christ's sake; and always to be valued in Him and for Him.

4. Now it is most important that we should realize clearly that this sanctity of marriage and home life, which seems perhaps to us self-evident, is being undermined, and that from several directions.

The libertine demand for freedom from restraint in sexual matters need not delay us long, though indeed it constitutes an appalling menace to the well-being of Society; for it is widely accepted in practice, it is supported or tolerated by a considerable mass of lay opinion in many countries, and actually receives a sort of public sanction from the amazing confusion and laxity of the divorce laws in some of the States of America. But it cannot be met by argument, but by giving to Christian opinion the moral authority of consistent and holy lives. There is, however, another enemy, more subtle and more respectable, whose approaches can only be met by argument founded on accurate and well marshalled information. This enemy is the modern scientific Socialism, which employs as its weapon the now popular hypothesis of Evolution. Here again we must distinguish between the crudely secularist and really anti-social dogmatism which appears to have its origin in Germany, and the patient reasoning and high moral purpose which are found in the speculations of such writers as Mr. H. G. Wells. It is quite plain that Christianity can have neither part nor lot in an ideal polity which regulates the sexual relation on simply material lines, mating human animals, as a stockbreeder mates his beasts, solely with a view to obtaining certain qualities in the offspring; or, at the other extreme, is ready to dispense with the social value of the strongest of human emotions, allowing them to run to waste in "the incidental and loose relations of individual and temporary desire".[1] It is indeed difficult to believe that such views of the destiny of marriage exercise an influence on the thought and conduct of normal human beings, though there is evidence that they are getting a hold among the working classes in Germany. And it is at all events permissible to hope that their influence will be evanescent; and that their prophets have fallen here also into that disregard of human nature as a factor in the problem, which invalidates so much of their most brilliant and attractive reasoning.

The more thoughtful and reverent school of Socialist thought presents a much more difficult and suggestive problem. In Mr. Wells's tract, *Socialism and the Family*, there are two points which strike the reader: first, that in the main lines of his argument the writer is

[1] F. G. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 143.

preaching naked Christianity; and second, that the principles for which he is contending have already, in great measure, been accepted in practice. Yet, for all that, it remains possible that some of his conclusions are based upon an incomplete induction, and vitiated by a confusion between things which are not *in pari materia*.

When Mr. Wells "proposes to give a man no more property in a woman than a woman has in a man", and so to "recognize in theory what in many classes is already the fact,—the practical equality of men and women in a civilized state",[1] we can go with him. When he tells us that "the socialist is prepared for an insistence upon intelligence and self-restraint quite beyond the current practice",[2] we cannot dispute the justice of the implied criticism. But when he speaks of marriage as "a relation which every year seems more limiting, and (except for its temporary passional aspect) purposeless",[3] and declares that "we live in a world of stupendous hypocrisies, a world wherein rakes and rascals champion the sacred institution of the family; and a net-work of sexual secrets, vaguely suspected, disagreeably present, and only half concealed, pervades every social group one enters",[4] he seems to be arguing from a partial survey of the facts, and to be hastily taking the clamorous discontented few as representative of the silent mass. Our experience is happily different. In the world as we know it, the "way of a man with a maid" is not an unclean mystery, the butt of prurient curiosity and leering innuendo, but a pleasant wholesome idyll. The solemn, passionate words of the Marriage Service, "for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part," are not felt to be either a hyperbole or a galling chain; nor, as experience proves, do they express an unattainable ideal, but a most blessed commonplace of life.

With regard to the second point mentioned above, the practical acceptance of the socialist principle, it is undeniable in more things perhaps, than we quite realize. The first Factory Act marks its entry into our legislation; and has been followed by a long series of Acts of Parliament, and Municipal By-laws. And in this particular it is worth while to observe, that the socialist principle, in so far as it involves renunciation or transfer of parental responsibility, was voluntarily adopted by the rich long before it was enforced upon the poorer classes.

It is now proposed to extend the same principle to more intimate and delicate human relations. The State, already Over Landlord and Over Employer, is to be Over Parent too. This train of reasoning is not without attractions for the logical mind: but a fallacy lurks in the premisses. The history of socialistic enterprise, in its successes and its failures alike, marks out clearly the possibilities and the limitations of its application. A large measure of socialism is necessary and beneficial in all matters which concern the bodily and economic welfare of the citizen: in what we may call the intellectual side of education, and, through it in the formation of character. But for

[1] p. 57. [2] p. 58. [3] p. 35. [4] p. 40.

the primary and essential education of character, for the training of the soul, the family is the ideal unit, not the State. There is no nursery of the Christian spirit which can be depended on, except the Christian home.

5. The standing argument of the advocates of State control is the existence of a large proportion of homes which do not approximate to any such ideal. Too many bad parents, parents who are unfit to have the charge of children, are found in every class: and, in extreme cases, the law rightly provides for the removal of children from their control. But it does not follow that it is either wise or just, for their sakes, to rob good parents of their freedom to serve the State in ways which freedom alone makes possible. It is the business of Christianity to form good parents, and convert bad ones. In the words of Dr. Creighton, "We must make it clear that we are not maintaining antiquated ecclesiastical prejudices, but are upholding the principles on which Family life is founded." Let us recognize frankly that in these matters it is not the day for ecclesiastical authority. In questions of belief and conduct, no one whose support is worth having will "hear the Church", unless it can appeal to reason and moral sense.

There is another thing whose day should be past, too, if the honourable estate of Matrimony is to do its just work in the Christian Life, and abide as the cornerstone of Christian society; and that is the ignorance, miscalled innocence, outcome of timidity, and false shame, and indolence, which sends youths and maidens unprepared, to meet the solemn obligations and duties of marriage. The time of innocence for our young people is ended, by a flood of literature dealing grossly or seductively with the carnal side of the sexual relation; which, in the conditions of modern life, the most guarded can hardly escape. Will not their souls be required at our hands, if we fail to put before them the facts in their true setting; if we deny them the counsels of wisdom and self-control, while we allow them to steep their minds in the pictured allurements of sense, the records of lawless passion, the stupid or wilful misrepresentation of the deeper and more lasting elements in marriage.

It is surely the duty of the Church to speak out on these subjects with no uncertain voice; and in its public and private teaching, and in the lives of its professed followers, to keep ever before itself, and before the world, an ideal of Christian marriage, which will attract by its beauty, and convince by its innate reasonableness.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

THE SANCTITY OF MARRIAGE

By BISHOP DOANE

I AM quite sure that in order to get the first impression of the sanctity of marriage, we have need to go back and learn the sacredness and dignity of the human body. We have so long been used to that mistranslation of St. Paul's statement about "the body of our humiliation" (the vile body), that we have come to associate the physical part of our nature with an idea of essential uncleanness; and, so doing, we forget that it was "made in the image of God", that our Lord took unto Himself human nature; that it is "the temple of the Holy Ghost"; and that it has in it the seed and germ, which, in the great day of resurrection, is to rise and be fashioned into the likeness of the body of Christ's Glory. First of all this needs to be carefully and wisely impressed upon children. There is a period of childhood when ignorance safeguards innocence, but there comes a time when children need wise and loving direction to guard them against the temptations which begin to assail them; and this must come from the father or mother, first and best of all. Textbooks on physiology, careful but thorough, are of use, but the real root of the matter is too delicate to be dealt with by a book, or a teacher to a class. And yet the child ought to come to a knowledge of its physical nature, not first by the presence and pressure of its developing demands, much less from the suggestion of evil companions, or the dangerous intimations of the so-called love story, in which lust masks itself under the name of love, and sensuousness is thinly veiled by sentimentality. Guarded in advance as to the grace of chastity in women or the virtue of continence in men, they might be saved from the start. And in the midst of the fearful warnings of ruin and misery, of seductions and suicides, of murders to conceal the other sin, there is plainly a call for more carefulness in dealing with boys and girls as to their reading, as to their exposure to the excitement of sensational dramas, as to their relations to each other, unprotected and unguarded, as to their knowledge of themselves; and somehow it must be impressed upon people, that purity and chastity are to be required and demanded of men as well as of women.

That old motto, "nil dictu visuve foedum haec limina tangat intra quae puer est," ought to be written over the threshold of the boys' home and the boys' school; and because marriage deals in part with the question of the flesh, of the passions of the animal nature, the dignity of the human body ought to be the foundation thought from which to build up the great fact of the sanctity of marriage. It is not the mating of animals, it is the union of two entire natures, each made in the image and stamped with the holiness and honour of creation and redemption, "into one flesh."

Then comes naturally and necessarily the thought of the inherent holiness of the relation before and apart from and even without the blessing of the Church. It is in itself a holy estate. What the Roman Church calls "the sacrament of marriage" (not without justification), what in other religious bodies is called "holy matrimony", is not really the marriage of two people, but the Church's benediction on their marriage, and if the Church does not, neither does the State, marry them. They marry each other, under the sanction, protection, and restriction of law, civil and ecclesiastical. When two people enter into an agreement to become man and wife, the common law recognizes them as married, if the agreement has been duly witnessed and recorded. The Priest or Magistrate is only called to give the sanction of the Church or of the State to the act.

Besides this, it must be recognized that marriage is an estate of life, continuous and permanent; that it is defined in a religious way by what the holy Scriptures say of it, and described by the statute in a civil and legal sense. The scriptural definition beyond all peradventure, whether in the language of its institution in Genesis, or in the language of its re-affirmation in the Gospels, is, that marriage is the union of one man and one woman for life. The most extreme extension of the words in one of the Gospels furnishes only one possible ground of dissolution of the contract (except death), namely, adultery; and while separation and divorce are recognized in the civil law, the causes, too many in some instances, are very accurately defined.

It may broadly and generally be assumed that when two people enter into a contract of marriage, it is implied and understood that they enter into this mutual relation for life. So, then, the great need of the time seems to be to impress upon men and women the seriousness, sacredness, and solemnity of marriage, that "it may not be entered into", as the prayer book of the Episcopal Church says, "unadvisedly, or lightly, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God." It is a sufficient indication of the seriousness of marriage that, as one has said, it is the only contract which a man and woman make *for life*, and the only contract that *cannot end by mutual consent*; the only contract for life that is *legally binding* and the only contract that is legally binding for more than a year, that is *not expressed in writing*. There are certain provisions of law which make for greater carefulness about marriage; the required licence, the required age, the consent of parents or guardians, the question of consanguinity. There ought to be more legal safeguards. And there

are certain canons and expressions of the Christian Church which throw an atmosphere about marriage indicating and insisting upon its dignity and its unique character.

And then with what seems almost "gilding refined gold" the Church takes her stand and asserts her strong conviction in the service that gives the blessing to the two coming to make their vows in the presence of the Priest. "In Santa Croce's holy precincts lie ashes that make them holier." So one may say that the Church's office for the solemnization of matrimony enhances and enforces its sanctity. It is called in the book of common prayer "holy matrimony", and we remember that this adjective is kept for only three other of the divine institutions, Holy Baptism, Holy Communion, Holy Orders. Not even the Laying on of Hands is honoured with this description. *Holy* Confirmation is a modern misuse of words. Only, with the two greater sacraments, and with the ministry, marriage seems to take this almost sacred place, having in very truth not only its "outward sign" but also its "inward grace", the very "grace of life", of which the man and the woman are heirs together: being, as St. Paul calls it, *μυστήριον*, which is sacrament in Greek; lacking the two descriptive characteristics, which mark the greater sacraments in our Anglican use, in that it was *not* "ordained by Christ Himself", and is *not* "generally necessary to salvation". And yet one hesitates to say that it was not ordained by Christ Himself; because He took it from its primeval institution and renewed its original honour when he adopted as His own its characteristic description. "They are no more twain but one flesh." "What therefore God has joined together let no man put asunder."

"The honourable estate instituted of God in the time of man's innocency signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church; which holy estate Christ adorned and beautified with His presence and first miracle that He wrought in Cana of Galilee"; this is the Church's description of what marriage is; changing, one might say, the common water of the mere civil act into the rich wine of a mysterious and sacred meaning. Again, the Church speaks of it as "the holy estate of Matrimony", as "God's holy ordinance", and pronounces them man and wife "in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost", adding the benediction in the Triune Name.

Here in America we are compelled to strain every nerve in our insistence upon the sanctity of marriage, because, I grieve to say, the country has gained a shameful and sorrowful pre-eminence in what one might almost call "the divorce habit", the statistics of which are alarming and shocking to the last degree. Slowly and steadily the public conscience is being stirred. Not only in Ecclesiastical bodies, but in the Legislatures and in Conferences called by the civil authorities, there is a widespread and strong movement toward reducing the causes for divorce *a vinculo*, and toward arresting the possibility of re-marriage, if not to the one only possible scriptural exception, at least to only six causes at the outside. Meanwhile the

safeguards against hasty and ill-considered marriages are coming to be more carefully defined and, in many States, increased. With the door of entrance into the Holy Estate guarded and consecrated, it is hoped that the door of exit, "the shameful divorce court," may some day be closed.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.
1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

LAW AND CUSTOMS OF MARRIAGE IN NON-CHRISTIAN LANDS (S. AFRICA OR AFRICA) AS BEARING ON MISSION DIFFICULTIES

By THE BISHOP OF St. JOHN'S, KAFFRARIA

So far as the Anglican Communion is concerned this subject may at once be narrowed down in South Africa to the customs of the several Bantu races, commonly, though inexactly and unreasonably, known as Kafirs. Polygamy is said to have been "tolerated" among the Bushmen,[1] and "recognized" among the Hottentots.[2] But the former are almost extinct—the census of 1891 returned only 5,296 as their number;[3] while the Hottentot proper is dying out in British South Africa. In 1891 their number was 42,891,[4] and they are not directly the object of any of the missions of the South African Province. So far as this paper is concerned, the tribes chiefly in view will be those dwelling within the diocese of St. John's. This comprises the "Transkeian Territories", i.e. the great native reserve which lies between Cape Colony proper, bounded on the south by the Great Kei River (or Inciba), and on the north by Natal. The problems are indicated by the two words Polygamy, and Lobola, or cattle dowry.

Of these Polygamy is undoubtedly the most formidable question with which the missionary has at present to deal. It is practically universal among the Bantu folk, and it penetrates the whole of the highly organized life of these peoples. Here it may be well to guard against what appears to be a prevalent misconception. South Africa is no longer the unknown country of the nineties; but if the country be known, the people, or peoples, are not. The Briton does not yet know the Dutch; while his ignorance of the native is, as yet, the darker for the partial knowledge which he has gained of him on the Rand, or in the Kimberley compounds, or in other centres of population. The native is naturally reticent. He is not less suspicious of strangers than, say, the Briton himself. The last person to whom he would be likely to disclose his mind would be the casual stranger or the traveller in a hurry; and natives on the mines of the Rand would give about as good a presentment of real native life as would

[1] *Natives of South Africa* (Murray, 1901), p. 1.
[2] Ibid., p 4.
[3] Quoted Ibid., p. 9.
[4] Ibid.

be given, say, by the Cornish miners who also work there of the life and habits of North Cornwall.

In the Transkei, by which in this paper is meant the whole of the Transkeian Territories, life is not in villages, but in what are practically village communities. It is highly organized; and it has an intensely conservative bias which bids fair to outlast the breaking up of the tribes. If the men, for whatever motive, go away for work—and they do go in very large numbers—this sort of work is incidental and for a special purpose. They intend to resume their country life. And this is not an idle life. As farmers or peasants their habits of work will compare favourably with those of the same class elsewhere in South Africa, of whatever race. They are not simply a collection of vagrants, whom the white man has for once induced to work—for their good—but part of a real society; and of this society as it exists polygamy is one of the fundamental institutions.[1] It is not a desire for sensual indulgence. It is the foundation of their home life, as marriage is elsewhere the foundation of all society; and it is regulated by rigid tradition.

Putting aside the case of chiefs, whose principal wife is in most tribes presented to the chief by the tribe after his accession to office, the first wife is a man's great or principal wife. He would commonly receive her from his parents, who would have arranged the marriage with the parents of the bride, probably without much consultation of her wishes, and possibly without consulting their son. He would certainly look forward to choosing later a second wife for himself. His parents would have provided the lobola, or cattle dowry, for the chief wife; for the second he would provide lobola himself, and, in order to procure the necessary cattle, would probably go out to work in the towns. This second wife, known as the right-hand wife, would have a separate kraal, and her children would inherit separately from those of the great wife. If a third wife be taken, she would in some tribes become the left-hand wife; but most commonly she would be attached to the kraal of the great wife,[2] and, if the latter were childless, her children would be reckoned as the children of the great wife, and her eldest son would be his father's heir, in precedence of those of the right-hand wife. They would in fact be in precisely the same position as the children of Bilhah, Rachel's handmaid. This third wife would thus be, no doubt, a concubine in the same sense; but the union is legalized according to native custom, and this secondary wife is known as iqadi, or a rafter, of the great house. A fourth wife, if one be taken, is similarly attached to the right-hand house. The iqadi is attached to a kraal of one of the wives, but she has her own hut; and in the Transkei her husband pays hut tax on that hut, on the understanding that she has a wifely status.

In the case of chiefs, certainly, the wives would each have their own establishment, sometimes at a considerable distance apart, and the husband would travel from one to the other. An attempt was made

[1] *Natives of South Africa*, p. 230.

[2] South African Native Affairs Commission, 1903–5, Evidence, Qu. 13372.

some years ago by a distinguished politician to qualify the status of a polygamist native's wives as practically slavery, and on this was founded an argument in favour of ever so slight a compulsion to labour, with a view, certainly, to provision for the mines, but also with the happy result of freeing native women. There is reason to believe that this view came dangerously near to being accepted as authoritative; but nothing could be further from the truth. It is based on the view of the native male as an incurable idler, whereas he is nothing of the sort. His women work, no doubt; but so does he. In old days he was fighter, hunter, litigant, master of cattle; and, if the course of events has deprived him of nearly all his occupations, time was needed for readjustment; and he is every year increasingly habituating himself to work on the land side by side with his women. On the other hand it is clear that the larger the number of women belonging to his household, the lighter will be the work of each of them. But as a matter of fact the women are said to approve of polygamy from another point of view. To belong to a great household is in itself a matter of pride.[1] It involves status and position.

The form of marriage is one of strict observance. It varies no doubt at different times and places,[2] but lobola, or cattle dowry is a constant feature: "that is to say, so many cattle are given for the woman. . . . So soon as the dowry has been paid, she is equipped and sent off to the man who asks for her. Usually she is sent off with a party. When the girl arrives at her destination a beast is killed, that is, blood is shed, signifying, I suppose, that the agreement of marriage has been sealed between the two. Then, as the ceremony proceeds, a beast is killed in the several stages of the ceremony, to signify the shedding of the blood, until the conclusion of the ceremony. At other times there is what is called umdudo, which is shown sometimes by a great dance. . . . When all this has been concluded, the girl is declared to be a wife."[3] All these ceremonies would only take place in the case of the great wife. Even in her case part would often be dispensed with; and at the present time some marriages take place with the barest minimum; though never without something, even if it be only the promise of the dowry cattle, by which the solemn intention is shown. About polygamy of this sort, two things are clear. First, it is inwrought into the very life of the people; and, secondly, there is nothing casual, or incidental, or haphazard. It is not a device for sensual indulgence. Clearly, this is a thing which deserves, and indeed demands, to be treated with respect.

The legal position is, indeed, a perplexing one. For Cape Colony proper, the position is settled by a judgement of the Supreme Court, which declines to recognize a polygamous marriage.[4] By this the Court appears to understand a marriage which is *potentially* polygamous,

[1] *Natives of South Africa*, p. 28.

[2] Ibid., Note 2:—"Something must pass between the parties to make the contract lawful. In times of scarcity and distress a basket of corn has been considered sufficient. Hoes of native manufacture, or indeed anything can be paid."

[3] S.A.N.A.C., Qu. 6,712: cf. 6,071 and 6,075.

[4] S.A.N.A.C., Qu. 5,763: cf. 10,152-6.

for it does not recognize even a first marriage if it have been made according to native custom merely; it recognizes no native marriage unless performed before a Government marriage officer. Consequently the local inferior Courts can entertain no claim as regards dowry, &c. The result is certainly unfortunate. These marriages are, no doubt, very far from reaching the Christian standard of absolute indissolubility; but the native recognizes them as constituting a binding tie, not to be lightly broken. The lobola is partly a guarantee of this. If a husband repudiates a wife without adequate reason, she returns to her father's kraal, and retains there the cattle which her husband gave as her lobola.[1] On the other hand, if the wife desert her husband, her parents are bound to aid him in bringing her back; failing this, there may be a claim on the husband's part to recover the cattle.[2] This is by old native law; so that, to the raw native, as we call him, marriage as a binding engagement is at the base of a stable society. The refusal of the Courts to recognize the value of his marriage engagement must place them to him at a lower moral level than his own; for he can know nothing of their ulterior aim, which is, no doubt, his emancipation from polygamy.

The Courts of the Transkei, on the other hand, while bound by the Superior Courts of the Colony, are allowed to modify their practice by admitting native custom, where it is not clearly contrary to good morals. In them these polygamous marriages are treated as real marriages, and claims for dowry cattle, &c., are entertained as a matter of course. Probably the magistrates, like the missionaries, of the Transkei would say that a very large proportion of their time is taken up with the intricacies of marriage disputes.

What then is the view and the policy of the Church in dealing with these unions?

It has varied a good deal from time to time and in different dioceses, and it varies still. The variation is even greater when one goes outside the Church, with the inevitable result that it becomes most difficult to maintain that comity with regard to the ecclesiastical discipline of other bodies which we all desire and which most of us endeavour to preserve. In 1902, with a view to laying the foundation of more uniform practice, the Bishops of the Province in Synod appointed a committee to collect information not only from other Christian bodies in South Africa, but from all Christian missions throughout the world. Abundant information was received; but so great was the divergence of practice that it has proved impossible at present to arrive at any coherent conclusions.

But, within the Church, it appears clear that the change of view has tended all one way—from a not unnatural disposition to disparage these unions, to a wider and more sympathetic consideration. We can readily understand that the first missionaries would reject altogether the idea of polygamy as constituting a marriage union at all. In this case the institution of lobola would further degrade it; for on the

[1] Ibid., Qu. 5,789. [2] Ibid., Qu. 13411–12.

surface it does certainly lend colour to the estimate, still held by some, of native marriage as being the mere purchase of a woman by a man, merely a commercial transaction. Hence it was to be no bar to Christian baptism. These women, not being wives, could be at once put away. The connexion, such as it was, was in itself a sinful union, and the sooner it was terminated, the better for all concerned. Thus an early missionary speaks of "the extent to which *this vice* is practised";[1] and again: "it is a violation of God's holy ordinance on the subject";[2] a statement no doubt true in the abstract, but true of the Bantu folk only in the sense in which it is true of the Hebrew patriarchs. In some cases it seems to have been at once perceived that the great wife occupied a special position, that she was in fact in some sort a real wife, and the convert was advised to marry her, or this may even have been made a condition of baptism. Other missionaries would, however, permit, or even encourage, marriage with another woman outside the circle of the deserted wives. Indeed it has from time to time been made a reproach to missionaries that their converts were attracted by the opportunity of getting rid of their existing establishments, and marrying a younger woman, possibly without having to pay lobola for her, if that happened to be the rule of the community which he was about to join.

This phase is reflected in the second part of a resolution passed by the Synod of South African Bishops in 1883. "A previous native marriage-union or contract is not of so close or binding a character as that of Christian marriage, and need be no bar to a Christian marriage with another person after conversion, provided all previous legal obligations have been fully discharged."[3] This resolution, with others bearing on the subject, has been suspended, having been referred by the Bishops to the consideration of the next Provincial Missionary Conference.

But experience has led missionaries to change their estimate of these marriages. In the first place, in the diocese of St. John's at least, there is a practically universal consensus as to the value of lobola. It is seen clearly that to describe a native as purchasing his wife is a grotesque misstatement. There is indeed a danger at times of our desire not to interfere with native customs bolstering up what is really degenerate, even from a native point of view. This was made abundantly clear three years ago in the case of what are known as Ntonjane ceremonies.[4] These had degenerated within the time of living men, as they readily admitted; and we appeared on the scene in time to crystallize the corruption and prevent such a reform as possibly the natives might have carried out had they been left to themselves. But in regard to lobola there is no such degeneration. One of the most experienced magistrates of the Transkei tells us: "I consider dowry the very fundamental principle upon which the whole social and moral system of the native race is based, and I think personally

[1] Shaw, *Story of my Mission*, p. 420. [2] ? Ibid.
[3] *Constitution and Canons of the Province* (1904), p. 79.
[4] Transkeian General Council. Report, 1905, p. 10.

the system of dowry should be adhered to to the very last moment."[1] No doubt all pecuniary considerations in relation to marriage lend themselves readily to its degradation, and lobola is no exception; but this is not peculiar to polygamy, nor to Bantu races. Our experience too has proved that there need be nothing in the practice of lobola which should be in the least degree repugnant to a sensitive Christian conscience.

Next, it has become possible to see that a polygamous marriage is, or may be, a real marriage. No doubt it is below the Christian standard; but that is not the question. We are not proposing to baptize polygamists, but to determine the value of the marriage; and the standard allowed to Hebrew patriarchs can scarcely be condemned as sinful in the case of native peoples. Unless we are prepared to annul the marriage of Jacob and Rachel, we must surely accept these marriages as at any rate on the same level. They are real marriages; real, but not Christian, not indissoluble. Real so far that, as opportunity serves, they appear to rank in St. Paul's sense with marriage, viz. that "if of two partners to a monogamic heathen marriage, one become a Christian, but the other be nevertheless willing still to continue in the conjugal union, the Christian partner is not to put the heathen one away; but if the heathen partner dissolve the marriage, the Christian is free to marry again".[2]

Are then the partners to a polygamous marriage subjects for baptism? In the case of the man clearly not. "No man still living as a polygamist can be admitted to Baptism or to the grade of Catechumen."[3] "A polygamist, on conversion, and before baptism, must put away all his wives but one, arranging if necessary for their support."[4] But this does not really touch the difficulty of the question. The husband cannot be accepted for baptism; he is a polygamist: but can the wife? Is she a polygamist because her husband has other spouses? She at least has only one. Is she to be penalized because of her husband's act, of which she is not guilty, and from which she cannot escape? But then, we now no longer advise the husband to put away his wives. Such certainly was the animus of the Act just quoted. A polygamist desiring to embrace Christianity would have been advised then to put away his wives, as of course. That was Bishop Key's view when the Act was passed. But I am in a position to know that that wise-hearted missionary altered his judgement in this matter. He became more impressed with the moral perils which threatened the repudiated women. One old missionary has stated that he had never known a case in which women thus put away that their husband might be baptized had not fallen into sin. And Bishop Key came to hold

[1] S.A.N.A.C., Qu. 13.538–41.

[2] *Acts, &c., of the Diocese of St. John's* (1902), XVI. 3. By 'monogamic' I understand, under our circumstances, the case where a man has either not proceeded to a second (polygamous) marriage or else has put away all wives but one, and so remains 'monogamic'.

[3] *Constitution and Canons*, p. 79. The rule is that of the South African Province, quoted without reference to different opinions held elsewhere.

[4] *Acts, &c.*, XVI. 1.

that a man had no right to win the covenanted blessing for himself at the risk of the souls of his wives. Then are we to refuse to allow him to put away his wives, and at the same time to admit the wives themselves to baptism? And is not this indeed to penalize the husband this time?

This, however, is the custom in the diocese of St. John's. Nominally the Bishop is held to weigh the claims of each case; for the Bishops of the Province have resolved that "the wife of a polygamist, not allowed by her husband to leave him, may not be admitted to the Catechumenate or to Holy Baptism without the special sanction of the Bishop, after he shall have fully considered the circumstances in each individual case";[1] but the diocese stands alone in the Province in its action. The question is in fact a complicated one. The Basuto missionaries state that it would be impossible thus to receive the wives of a Mosuto polygamist, or at least the inferior wives, on the ground that they have no control over their own persons, which may be placed by their husband at the disposal of a guest. This is a practice which is also found among the Basuto who have migrated east of the Drakensberg into the Transkei; but it is believed to be absolutely unknown among the "Kafirs".

Thus in South Africa practice in this matter is by no means settled, but it will be impossible permanently to acquiesce in the divergence which at present prevails; and it is not at all certain that the practice of generally admitting the wives while precluding the husband has really worked well on the whole.

It is possible that another course might be adopted, which would at least have the important merit of meting out equal treatment to husband and wives. The wives, it is true, are not polygamist; but they are certainly parties, as well as their husband, to a polygamous union. Without any desire to press an analogy which would be misleading, this is seen at once in the case of polyandry. No one, it is presumed, would propose to admit the husband of a polyandrous union to baptism. The polygamists, men and women, might, it is suggested, be admitted to a special class. There appears to be no reason why their polygamy should exclude them from the classes of inquirers and catechumens; and then, when they are ready for baptism, seeing that they have, *ex hypothesi*, the further qualification beyond other candidates of being willing to wait in patience until God's will is made clear for them, they might form a class, say, of Expectants, ranking next after the baptized and admitted to all Church privileges save the actual reception of the Sacraments.

Such a plan might be tolerable as a temporary measure; and in South Africa nothing further is needed. We are told on all hands that polygamy is doomed.[2] "I do not think that it is necessary," says one of the most expert witnesses, "to prohibit polygamy, because I think it is gradually dying out." No one seems to be quite sure of

[1] *Constitution and Canons*, p. 79.

[2] S.A.N.A.C., Qu. 3,259; 3,262; 4,620–1; 5,753; 6,060; 6,745; 7,593; 10,037; 15,539, and *passim*.

the reason. It is because of the rinderpest and the consequent scarcity of cattle; or because the wars are over, and, as men are no longer killed, the number of the sexes is becoming equalized; or, says one native witness who really knows his people, it is "the result of natural causes". Whatever the cause, the trend is certainly all in one direction. When polygamy is gone, new and serious problems must at once arise in this virile race. But as we watch, and assist, the passing of the old order, there is the clearest duty of sympathy and patience.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

CHRISTIANITY AND MARRIAGE QUESTIONS IN JAPAN

By the Bishop of South Tokyo

(BISHOP WILLIAM AWDRY, D.D.)

Marriage conditions, customs, and laws have been exceedingly lax in Japan; but three great forces:—(1) Philosophy, (2) Government, and (3) Christianity, are earnestly engaged in tightening the marriage bond, each conscious of the others' work, yet not taking much apparent notice of each other.

1. Philosophy

That "Marriage should be the union of one man with one woman on equal terms as long as the two lives last is one of the first principles of practical ethics" is the statement of Mr. Fukuzawa and the school of educationalists, moralists, and philosophers which has grown up under his influence—a statement gravely put forth in a summary of the principles of practical ethics which they compiled some six or seven years ago, in view of the likelihood that Mr. Fukuzawa himself might not be much longer among them. Neither he nor they were Christians. The doctrine was, therefore, not accepted on authority but on its own merits, as judged by persons who were "proving all things" that came under their cognizance from East or West, and "holding fast that which is good" as it appeared to them in the interest of their country and of mankind.

I need hardly say that this doctrine does not express even the ideal of any part of heathendom; but it is the ideal of marriage in Christendom derived directly from our Lord Himself and from nowhere else.

An idea lingers still, even in England, and would be freely acknowledged throughout heathendom and Japan, that the sin of a married man in offending with an unmarried woman is different in kind and much less in degree than that of any man, married or unmarried,

offending with a married woman. The sin in the latter case is considered adultery ; in the former case it may be fornication ; it is bad form, inconsistent, except under special circumstances to be mentioned presently, with the highest type of character, but yet a peccadillo compared with adultery.

This distinction rests upon the axiom, recognized or unrecognized, that the woman is not merely " for the man " (1 Cor. xi. 9), but is in some sense his property by marriage in a way in which the man is not the woman's property by marriage ; and thus adultery is of the nature of robbery, where the crime is not against the property but against the owner of the property. Adultery is regarded as an offence against the husband, not the wife, and it is supposed that there can be no such thing as adultery if the woman does not belong to a husband.

Our Lord's words, " He committeth adultery *against her*," against *the woman*, implying that Christian marriage is a union on equal terms as between the two sexes, were a startling and seemingly impossible novelty even to the disciples themselves (St. Matt. xix. 10). It is a revelation from our Lord's lips. And that this revelation has approved itself to a school of non-christian moral philosophers in Japan, however small as yet their following, is a fact of the highest significance and importance.

The method of the philosophers is, of course, simply influence by ideals and examples, and undoubtedly Mr. Fukuzawa's domestic life was in full accord with his teaching.

Before proceeding to the ways in which the Government is tightening the marriage bond, it is necessary to say something of the peculiar customs of the Japanese with regard to adoption, and marriage formalities.

The family is an entity, recognized by the law, which must not lightly be allowed to die out, nor to be merged in another without express consent of the authorities. If a man has no child by his wife, he chooses and adopts an heir ; and as the heir is not merely to inherit the property, but to continue the family, he may in fulfilling his duty to his ancestors and to the state prefer to adopt a son of his own born out of wedlock, or, without the slightest wish to separate from his wedded wife, he may beget a son elsewhere to become her son by adoption, just as Abraham did. It will be observed that this need imply no laxity of morals and no selfishness, but only a great difference of social custom. It will probably have to be modified if social relations are to become very close between Japanese and Western peoples whose

marriage law largely rests on Christ's teaching; but it would be a great mistake to regard it as either low or loose. It is part of a complete social system, and conformity to it may often involve genuine self-denial and self-sacrifice.

Adoption in Japan, as in the East generally, is recognized as in all respects equivalent to birth into the family. It is astonishing to us Western people, and very confusing, to find what a large proportion of the men within the circle of our own acquaintance thus change their surnames through transfer from one family to another.

In some cases difficulties are not unlikely to arise, for a son may be born of the wife after the adoption has taken place, or the first wife may die and a second wife may prove fruitful; yet the adoption was a legal matter, and if the motive was to provide a head for a family which would otherwise die out, it is an affair of the state. Again, there may be daughters but no son. A woman can be heir to the headship of the family, and in that case usually some one is adopted to marry the heiress and carry on the family. His rights are limited, and his position in the family is often uncomfortable. But since one family must not be merged in another, it follows that if a man so adopted afterwards through any circumstances becomes the head of his own family, the marriage of the two, even if already consummated, would be dissolved by the death of the parents unless one or other of the families chooses another head. The choice to the headship of a family rests with the family council, a legal institution which has authority in such matters as marriage, divorce, adoption, competence to manage the family affairs, &c., and as, after the selection of one to continue the father's family, each of the other brothers probably becomes the founder of a new family, it is plain that cases in which the prospective headship of a family may affect the stability of a marriage are not uncommon. The formalities which go to constitute marriage in Japan are peculiar and very seriously separate the Christian from the non-christian idea of marriage. There are two parts in a Japanese marriage, one social, the other civic. The social rite is practically indispensable. Outside Christian circles it almost always takes place first, generally some months before the other. Indeed the civic rite is very often dispensed with altogether, and yet the parties are fully recognized in society as man and wife. The essential feature of the social rite is that the bride and bridegroom drink out of the same cup in the presence of the two persons who have brought them together and become the witnesses to and guardians of the marriage. As soon as this is over the two live together

in all honour as Mr. and Mrs. So-and-so. But as yet they are not legally man and wife. In the public register every woman is on the roll of some man who is for the time being the head of her family. When the head of her family in agreement with her husband or the head of his family gets her name struck off his roll and entered on her husband's roll, then and not till then the law knows of the marriage: she changes her legal name, and children born of the two are legitimate. The ease and frequency of adoption makes legitimacy comparatively unimportant, for nothing could be more easy and natural than to adopt your own illegitimate children, especially as, when the parents have been living together recognized as man and wife, there is no slur on the children's parentage.

It is the office of the woman's father to take the initiative in the legalizing of marriage by registration, and it would be somewhat rude of the husband to urge this upon the father. For this and for other reasons the registration is generally deferred till it can be seen whether the woman will get on well with the husband and his family, whether the marriage is likely to be fruitful, &c. The woman's father is thus able to take her back if necessary for her happiness, or the husband's family to send her back if she does not get on well with them, without any public scandal. As the wife is not the head woman of the family so long as her husband's mother is alive, and a man cannot change his mother but can change his wife, such cases of separation for incompatibility after the social marriage is consummated cannot fail to be common. Even after registration they probably are not rare; but in that case a divorce by reference to the authorities for the cancelling of registration is necessary. In all cases the witnesses to the marriage, and the heads of the families, must be consenting parties; but where separation is desired, the reasons which cause the desire probably are operative on both sides, and those who represent each side are probably more solicitous for the happiness of the parties whom they represent than for the permanence of the marriage tie: so consent is very easily obtained.

2. Government

We may notice four matters in which recent Government action has worked towards raising the ideal of marriage.

(*a*) The Emperor himself, when the Crown Prince was to be married, ordered a ceremonial to be formulated for marriages in the Royal Family. The ceremonial adopted is of great interest; but what we are

concerned with here is that henceforward marriages of the Royal Family were to be regarded as matters of public concern, not merely domestic affairs. Hence, also, the dissolution of such a marriage cannot now be a merely domestic matter. This example in the highest rank cannot fail to have a great effect in adding solemnity to marriage.

(*b*) Again, from the new civil code the word for concubine has disappeared altogether, though a remnant of old ideas is left in the word expressing the natural son adopted into the family by the father.

(*c*) During the recent war, the families of soldiers who had died without having their marriages made legal by registration found, often to their great surprise, that they were wholly unrecognized by the law. Thus many thousands of them needed special assistance outside the law, and many thousands of soldiers' marriages were registered during the war that the wives might be entitled to benefits. This cannot fail to bring prompt registration more into vogue with the humbler classes, since every Japanese under a system of conscription is presumably a soldier.

(*d*) The new civil code gives the woman practically the same right as the man to initiate proceedings for divorce. Where divorce is so easy and so frequent as in Japan, where people so much dislike public attention being called to their family affairs, and where, moreover, the wife need not greatly fear divorce, if it is not her own fault, because it carries very little stigma and is no bar to remarriage; this provision tends to make the man more thoughtful in entering upon marriage, and more careful how he does what is likely to break it off. Probably this purpose was not absent from the mind of the legislators.

3. Christianity

The Christian Japanese are doing much to raise the character of marriage in Japan; chiefly by drawing together on principle the dates of the social and the legal rite. In the canon on marriage in force among the members of our communion the sentences bearing on this point run as follows: "Persons desiring to be married shall, three days in advance, prepare the notice of marriage required by the law of the land, and present the same to the officiating clergyman. Persons who have already given the legal notice shall present a copy of the official register.

"The officiating clergyman shall, immediately after the marriage, enter upon the register (of the Church) the domicile, residence, age,

and rank of the parties, the names of their parents, and the place and date of the marriage, and shall together with the parties and two witnesses sign and seal the (Church) register, and shall give the former a copy of the registration.

"The parties shall, immediately after the ceremony, give notice of their marriage to the (civil) registrar, and shall give notice of their having done so to the officiating clergyman."

When first carried, some six weeks ago, this canon ventured only to require that care should be taken at the time of the service in Church to see that civil registration should be in a fair way to being carried out as soon as possible. It was not missionary pressure but the Japanese themselves who took the initiative in giving it the more stringent form which it now has. Thus the greatest of all obstacles to a satisfactory marriage system, the double form of marriage with an interval during which the marriage is in an experimental stage, is done away with for our Christians.

The marriage canon is very incomplete, however, though we have been at work upon it for many years. We are all agreed that marriages of Christians with unbelievers are not to have any Christian blessing in Church, also that if a baptized Christian wishes to marry a Catechumen, such marriage is not permitted without the special sanction of the bishop given for exceptional reasons. (It must be remembered that Japanese marriage is, of course, a civil contract. No Christian body can either give or take away the status of husband or wife. What we can do is to prohibit the Church's blessing upon it, the use of the church and the services of the clergy, and to impose ecclesiastical discipline upon the offenders.) The question of prohibited degrees is the crux which for the present defers the completion of the canon, and the "Deceased Wife's Sister" is the crux of the crux. There is no abstract desire for or approval of any marriages to which we should take objection, and it is recognized that while Christians must not enter into alliances forbidden by the state, there is no reason why they should not abstain from alliances which the state does not forbid. But they see no sufficient reason for making a Church law out of line with the State law, under the influence of foreigners in whose own countries, though steeped in Christian tradition, law does not consistently forbid such unions. Under these circumstances, with the tide of popular opinion and of legislation rising on the subject of marriage, the bishops feel that it would be unwise to stereotype by the enactment of a canon anything below the highest standard which may hereafter become

attainable. They have, therefore, refused assent to any canon as yet proposed on this subject, though in all but one or two points satisfactory, and have dealt administratively with the very few cases which arise.

A Christian girl in a non-christian family has often very great difficulty in refusing a marriage with an unbeliever, for though legally no person can be either betrothed or married, or indeed divorced, without his or her own consent, yet betrothals which are regarded as binding are often made some years before marriage, and a girl of fifteen may have the whole weight of family pressure brought to bear to make her consent to a "suitable marriage" arranged for her. Hence the baptism of girls in the higher ranks is attended with great anxiety, and is often long delayed against their will.

Questions of the marriage of persons who have a former husband or wife living, are dealt with by the bishops according to the circumstances of the several cases. These vary immensely. We have nothing to do with what may have happened before the person became a Christian, and when she (or more rarely he) is divorced because of becoming a Christian, we have St. Paul's authority in favour of liberty, though we may advise patience and the effort to win over the unbelieving partner. But where it is a case of desertion, or where the divorce has been long delayed after one party became a Christian, there is no more doubt. Theoretically the marriage, if legal, should stand; if social only it should be legalized, or the connexion broken off. Practically, however, the unbelieving partner may make this almost if not quite impossible. The bishop has, therefore, to consider all circumstances before giving a judgement.

I have written of things as we meet and deal with them among the Christians of our own communion. Other Christian bodies act differently, or in some cases appear to rest only on Christian public opinion, and to have no rule at all on these topics. Our rule and practice is, I think, influential for good beyond our own circle.

On the whole there is satisfactory progress in Japan generally, and our position, though not free from difficulty, is very stimulating and hopeful. Profound national changes of usage or of sentiment on such topics can hardly be the work of less than a generation. We shall do wisely to let the foreign hand be felt as little as possible, and while maintaining the highest standards in our life and teaching, to do what we can towards preventing lower ideals from being stereotyped by premature enactments. It must always be remembered that if

custom in regard to marriage is very lax in Japan, this is due less perhaps to looseness of moral fibre or mere self-indulgence than to ideas which in the West belong to the ancient world and have passed away with it; and that at the present time Japan in these things is on the up-grade, while we, it is to be feared, are on the down. Nor is it a small matter that on this subject law, philosophy, and Christianity are independently working in the same direction. The issue is fraught with the gravest consequences; but it lies with God. May we, Japanese Christians, and English and American Missionaries alike, be intelligent, efficient, and docile instruments in his Hand.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS OF LICENCE AS TO MARRIAGE: ENGLAND

By THE REV. E. DAVIS, Vicar of Lowmoor, Bradford

Licence being unrestrained liberty of action, licence as to marriage is equivalent to free indulgence in acting contrary, or in opposition, to the restraints enjoined by marriage laws.

These restraints are Ecclesiastical and Civil. The Ecclesiastical operate for purposes of the Church; the Civil for legal purposes of the State.

In England, before the year 1857, the ecclesiastical and the civil restraints were essentially identical. From that date certain ecclesiastical restraints have become inoperative for legal purposes of the State. What was licence before 1857 is not necessarily, from a civil point of view, licence now. But, from the point of view of the Church, all the ecclesiastical restraints are operative still; and disobedience in regard to them is the measure of licence as to marriage, involving, in varying degrees, moral lawlessness, and the loss of Church privileges. Such licence is also fraught with very grave and far-reaching moral consequences.

But it is sometimes argued that the law of marriage which commands the universal obedience of mankind is not, of necessity, either the ecclesiastical law of the Church or the civil law of the State, but the Law of God: that the divine restraints of marriage are not always identical with the civil or ecclesiastical restraints: that, consequently action, within these divine restraints, is lawful, and ought not to be considered a bar to the enjoyment of spiritual privileges. This is true. And if to be married with a religious ceremony is the spiritual privilege sought, there is now no bar to the enjoyment of it. Recent legislation allows all persons, wishing to be married, to choose their own "appointed minister" and that "form of religious ceremony" which is agreeable to their view of the Law of God. A difficulty only arises when a claim is made by any guilty of ecclesiastical licence, to be married according to the Church's Form for the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony. This would itself be licence as to marriage, and as such cannot be allowed.

The subject, then, of the development of licence as to marriage, from a Church point of view, includes a consideration of the restraints of marriage enjoined by the English Church as Canon Law, and the grave consequences following the disregard of them. But one preliminary remark must be made. The ecclesiastical law of the Catholic Church is twofold. It embraces the Law of God, which is irrevocable, and ecclesiastical canons of discipline which are revocable by the authority which enjoined them. These from time to time have varied

—the law of the disabilities of the forbidden degrees is a case in point—the former, however, never. The indissolubility of marriage has always been enforced as the Law of God. But all the ecclesiastical canons in force in England in the twenty-fifth year of Henry VIII operate now. They form, together with later canons, the English Church Law. There is one difference. Disciplinary canons were formerly subjects of dispensation by proper canonical authority. Now, in England, the power of dispensing is very limited, and the Church is definitely precluded from exercising this power in the matter of the disabilities of the forbidden degrees. To do so constitutes "licence as to marriage".

In considering the restraints of the ecclesiastical laws relating to marriage, it may be conveniently stated, generally, that the canons define the prerequisite conditions of marriage, the form of its solemnization, and the laws which are binding upon married persons. Licence is the contravention of any of these.

Of the prerequisite conditions, prenuptial chastity; capacity for the procreation of children; relationship, if any, outside the prohibited degrees; are of primary importance. It will be best to consider them in order.

The widespread prevalence of licence as to prenuptial chastity is only too evident to serious observers. The startling records of illegitimacy supply one grave indication.

In England and Wales during the year 1903, there were born out of wedlock 37,302 children, the total births for the year being 948,271. In 1905 the total births amounted to 929,293, of which 37,315 were born out of wedlock.

It is also interesting to compare the various districts. Thus in 1905 there were in the

1	London District	126,559	births	4,786	being illegitimate.
2	South-Eastern District . .	83,725	,,	3,509	,, ,,
3	South Midland District . .	60,150	,,	2,267	,, ,,
4	Eastern District	54,422	,,	2,233	,, ,,
5	South-Western District . .	44,884	,,	1,809	,, ,,
6	West Midland District . .	107,764	,,	4,230	,, ,,
7	North Midland District . .	59,774	,,	2,822	,, ,,
8	North-Western District . .	151,037	,,	5,737	,, ,,
9	Yorkshire District . . .	102,003	,,	4,673	,, ,,
10	Northern District	72,060	,,	2,784	,, ,,
11	Welsh District	66,888	,,	2,465	,, ,,

From these figures it will be seen that unchastity productive of illegitimacy, whether prenuptial or not (that is, whether the persons marry afterwards or not) is pretty evenly distributed over every part of the country and that it is equally bad in all parts, one twenty-fifth of the children born being illegitimate.

But this is only one symptom of the awful and widespread practice of licence in the way of unchastity. Another is prenuptial unchastity, strictly so called. In many districts—in some probably more than in others—and certainly in the West Riding of Yorkshire, this form of

licence is very common indeed. Experience reveals the fact that it is terribly far-reaching and shamelessly practised. The development has many characteristics of its own. Loyalty is rarely absent, and there is generally apparent affection and devotion. Public marriage is looked upon as removing all irregularity and sealing the contract. And this is the common sentiment of great portions of the community. Moreover, one ruling principle confessedly is, that offspring may be assured. Clearly this form of licence is really secret marriage, and degrades wedlock from a holy estate, entered into and supported by the sanction of religion, to a civil contract outwardly graced by the form of a religious service, which only has a meaning in connexion with the solemnization of holy matrimony, at least according to the mind of the Church.

In considering the causes of the development of this licence several questions suggest themselves.

First, may there not be some connexion between this form of licence and the impossibility in England of a dissolution of marriage on the canonical ground of natural incapacity? It is possible that there may be a closer relation than at first sight appears.

Then, secondly, is not the suspension of ecclesiastical discipline in this, and in other respects, greatly responsible for the existence of such licence? Would not the restoration of discipline which, in cases of prenuptial unchastity, requires penitential reconciliation as a prior condition to the solemnization of holy matrimony, do more than anything else to check this licence?

Again, is not the Church often culpably responsible for some measure of this base development? In Yorkshire, at least, crowds, guilty of this licence, may be seen forsaking their own parish church and resorting to the old parish church of the town or city, where, in the crowd, they go through the form of marriage; thus acting contrary to the Church's law. Parochial discipline under such conditions is impossible, and the loss of it assists the development of licence.

There remains for consideration the impediments to marriage, which include forbidden relationships and any condition of life, in either party, which is contrary to the Church's law. Recent developments have to do with marriage with a deceased wife's sister and the marriage of divorced persons.

Non-lawful marriage being by the law of the Church indissoluble, divorced persons are subject to the disabilities prohibitive of marriage. Ecclesiastical divorce is that enforced by a disciplinary judicial sentence, which effectively separates parties lawfully married *à thoro et mensa*, on account of such transgressions as cruelty or adultery, but with a caution that they shall live chastely and continently. This excludes the re-marriage of either party, innocent or guilty, during the life of the other. The second form of divorce is that which follows a declaratory judicial sentence, declaring that, owing to some antecedent impediment, such as consanguinity or affinity, the marriage is void *ab initio*. Since, then, there was no lawful marriage, the parties may afterwards enter into the holy estate of matrimony. Churchmen,

as such, are subject to this law, and the suspension of the Church courts, in regard to causes matrimonial, does not affect them. It is the law of the Church and effective for spiritual purposes. Those who live contrary to this law, from a Church point of view, are guilty of licence. Since 1857 civil divorce has been granted by the civil courts dissolving the bond of matrimony, not only for antecedent disabilities prohibitive of marriage, but also for adultery, cruelty, and other transgressions; and the increasing frequency and grave results of this have become alarming. During the first ten years from 1857 there were 1,481 divorces decreed by the civil courts. During the next ten years the number amounted to 2,382. In the third decade 3,458 suits were successful, and the five following years saw 1,858 decrees dissolving marriage. Thus from 1857 to 1892, for which period figures are available, 9,179 couples, or 18,358 married persons, obtained from the State a dissolution of the bond of matrimony. And experience teaches that the increase noted is being maintained. Moreover, in this connexion, it must be remembered that petitions for divorce, which indicate very grave conditions of life, exceed by one-third the number successful. How many of these, from a Church point of view, are divorced agreeably to ecclesiastical law it is impossible to say. Probably they are very few. But one thing is certain: the transgressions of the Church's law by divorced persons not living "chastely or continently", to use the words of the canon, but "re-marrying", from the point of view of the State, are of increasingly grave concern. The growing extent of this licence as to marriage is partly revealed by the registers of marriage, in which those previously divorced are described as such. These were from 1861 to 1867, 188. During the next decade they were 604: in the decade following they numbered 1,322: in the next five years they were 883: in the three years 1900-2 they amounted to 1,285: in the next three years to 1,657. These figures speak for themselves. And when it is considered what divorce means, in all the accompanying circumstances, the matter would seem to become a material concern. As affecting the Church, however, the case is clear. Persons suffering such grave disabilities cannot be admitted, by the Church, into the holy estate of matrimony; nor be thought of as capable of receiving Church privileges, so long as they continue to transgress the Church's law.

Marriage with a deceased wife's sister is another matter of concern. The Act of Parliament recently passed has made this possible as a civil contract. But the Act leaves the ecclesiastical law effective for Church purposes. No person within the Church's prohibited degrees may claim the right of being married in the face of the Church. The clergy are even specially prevented from entering into the civil contract, which the Act allows to all others.

It is too soon to form any opinion as to the future consequences of this new legislation, but inquiries would seem to show that, at present, the proportion of persons desiring to enter into such unions is about two in one thousand of the population. With the liberty now allowed there will probably be a gradual development of this licence as to marriage, but the duty of the Church clearly lies in strict obedience

to ecclesiastical law, and in refusing to allow a man to marry his deceased wife's sister, through the instrumentality of the ministry, and also in maintaining that such marriages are, from an ecclesiastical point of view, null and void.

The law of the Church concerning the Form of the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony must now be considered. What is licence will then be evident.

The ecclesiastical laws regulating the solemnization of matrimony require that the ceremony shall take place after the publication of banns, or the production of a licence issued by the Church authority. The State law allows a parish priest to accept a superintendent registrar's certificate in lieu of banns. Moreover, the banns must be published in the church of the parish wherein the persons to be married dwell, or if they live in divers parishes they must be asked in both. The law provides for publicity to ensure the absence of impediments as to the legality of the marriage.

In populous centres there is much licence existing in this matter. Banns of marriage are asked, and persons are married, in many old parish churches which are not the churches of the ecclesiastical parish in which the contracting parties dwell. Publicity is avoided. Licence as to marriage, in the way of prenuptial unchastity, and the repudiation of the prohibitive degrees, is practically encouraged. The power of the parish priest, in the administration of his cure, is seriously weakened. All conception of the sanctity of marriage is in many parts almost completely lost.

The development of the tendency to consider marriage rather as a civil contract than a holy estate may be measured by information supplied in official returns. Previously to the year 1836 all marriages in England, excepting those of Jews and Quakers, were required to be solemnized according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England. Since that year it has been possible, for those who wish it, to be married, from a State point of view, before the district registrar; and more lately before an appointed person in a chapel. In 1903 261,103 marriages were registered. Of these, 170,044 were married according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England; 44,520 before the district registrar in his office; 26,538 before the registrar in denominational chapels; 7,380 before an appointed minister in chapels; 10,621 were Roman Catholic marriages;—in the latter case the civil marriage took place first before the registrar, in the vestry, and the religious ceremony followed. Of Quakers there were 106 marriages, and of Jews 1,894. In the year 1905 the numbers were: total marriages 260,742; Church of England 165,747; before the registrar in his office, 47,768; before the registrar in chapels, 26,097; before the appointed minister in chapels, 8,258; Roman Catholic marriages, 10,812; Quakers, 80; Jews, 1,980. Thus the purely secular marriages are steadily increasing, and the idea of the sanctity of marriage is proportionately decreasing. The existence of these facts seems to be a very definite call to the Church, to consider whether licence in her practice as to the publication of banns, and the solemnization of mar-

riages in churches other than the proper parish churches of the persons concerned, has not had much to do with the development of this idea. For the removal of publicity makes licence easy, and licence is destructive of sanctity. To make use of the State's permission to accept the registrar's certificate is a less evil; for this makes it possible for the parish priest to learn the condition of the contracting party before solemnizing the marriage.

One other development connected with a matter closely touching the solemnization of holy matrimony must be noticed. In the year 1857 the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts was suspended in causes matrimonial in everything, except in the authority to issue licences for marriage. These licences were the Church's licences, and were limited in their terms and operation by the law of the Church. Since then, some chancellors have issued these licenses under the authority of the Church courts, but according to the provisions of the civil law. They have allowed the marriage of persons divorced for adultery! This is "licence as to marriage" indeed! And, as to the effects, it breeds shameless licence. For so long as the Church seems to sanction the breaking of her own laws by her own officials, it cannot but result that licence will increase, and in this case such licence!—the licence of adultery and all the debasing horrors attending it. Here is one of the gravest of questions crying out for immediate solution.

There is one other element deserving attention. The solemnization of marriage according to the Church's intention ought to be connected with a celebration of Holy Communion. Christ's presence sanctifies the union of His members in proportion as they approach Him worthily. The sanctity of marriage flows from this. It is therefore a matter for consideration whether, with a view to the restoration of this truth in the minds of churchmen, it is not advisable to separate the civil contract from the religious ceremony in marriage, and to reserve the latter for those who obey the Church's law. A sure method of restraining licence is to refuse to apparently clothe it with religious sanctity.

A further question relates to the development of licence as to marriage during the married state. This was ordained to ensure continency; the discipline of family life; and the procreation and religious education of children.

Licence here takes the form of the married not living continently, nor cleaving to one another, but, with growing frequency, attaching themselves to others; impelled by likes and dislikes, by lust, by resentment against discipline, by indulging a depraved appetite for unrestrained personal liberty. The revelations of the Divorce Court are the symptoms of this licence, which tends to the destruction of family life, and treats marriage as a matter of mere convenience and self-indulgence.

The serious proportionate decrease in the birth-rate in England points to another form of licence in married persons. There is a growing tendency to look upon offspring only from the point of view of utility, and as a hindrance to ease and comfort. Where wage-earners are desired there is licence in one direction; where they are not there

is licence in another. The checking of the increase of population is from every point of view a grave moral, social, political, and religious question, urgently demanding serious attention.

It may be helpful to consider facts relating to one large city and to England and Wales.

Mean birth-rate per 1,000 of population.

	1881	1891	1901	1906
City of Bradford . . .	33·0	27·7	23·0	20·6

This reveals a decrease in the birth-rate of 38 per cent. since 1881.

England and Wales . .	34·0	30·7	28·6	27·0

Birth-rate per 1,000 women aged 15–45.

	1880–2	1890–2	1900–2	1906
City of Bradford . . .	129·1	105·3	83·8	75·5
England and Wales . .	147·7	129·7	114·8	?

This table shows that the true decrease is greater than that indicated above. The facts speak for themselves.

It remains to look at licence as to marriage from the point of view of the State, and the duty of the Church regarding it.

The State, which treats marriage as a civil contract, takes no cognizance of the moral condition of the parties before marriage; allows persons divorced by its own court to marry again; permits a man to marry his deceased wife's sister. Ecclesiastical licence in these matters is of no account to the State. But the State nowhere pretends to assert that this licence shall not be reckoned as such, for spiritual purposes. Only in one particular does the State compel a clergyman to break Church law by lending his church for the marriage of divorced persons, and, in another, protects him from censure if he performs the ceremony himself. But this latter does not compel him to break the Church's law. And in every other particular the administrative power of the Church is practically confirmed. Licence as to marriage remains, ecclesiastically, licence, and subject to ecclesiastical censures. Those who administer Church affairs are nowhere relieved of their obligation to administer them according to Church law.

A question requiring notice is concerned with licence as to marriage, when repudiating all law. There are ugly signs of a development of illicit marriages, wanting even the civil contract, and that among very young people. And with this are connected many grave evils. The birth-rate of illegitimate children, indeed, shows a decrease. Per 1,000 of unmarried or widowed women, aged 15 to 40, it was:

	1880–2	1890–2	1900–2	1906
City of Bradford . . .	17·6	9·2	7·1	5·9
England and Wales . .	14·1	10·5	8·5	?

But this proves nothing. Such might be expected from the general decrease in the birth-rate. Under the circumstances, however, the fact tends to confirm the truth of the suspicion regarding the immoral

cause of that decrease. This licence, in the married state, or out of it, thrives upon the knowledge acquired, through which the decrease comes about. The growth of knowledge has assisted the development of sin.

And another criminal licence as to marriage, repudiating all law, must not be omitted. Incest in England is not punishable as an offence, but it is said to be one of the causes of the physical deterioration of the lower classes of the larger towns and cities of the country. Such is a further heinous form of licence, sinful, beyond measure immoral, yet widespread and terribly grave in its consequences!

What, then, is the Church's duty?

Licence as to marriage in all its most depraved and debasing forms cannot be touched by municipal or parliamentary enactments. Education, without religion, advances it. Only the ministrations of the Church can really reach it. Penitential discipline alone is able to effect a cure. Figures have been quoted with reference to the City of Bradford which illustrate this. Bradford justly boasts of its commercial and educational progress. During the fifty years previous to 1881, the population of this great industrial centre increased, with its increasing prosperity, by leaps and bounds. A small town became an enormous city. Since 1881, in less prosperous but more luxurious days, the birth-rate has seriously and suggestively declined. "The fall in the Bradford birth-rate has been greater than in the rest of England." Here, where education is almost idolized; where the Church is numerically weak; where there are only 92 clergy to minister to 400,000 souls; where the penitential discipline of the Church is a negligible quantity: here the birth-rate points to ugly licence as to marriage, a prenuptial unchastity is viewed commercially. Is not this a matter for reflection?

Licence develops when the restraining influence of the Church is weak. May it not be the fact that past neglect to recognize this, and the truth of the converse, has been gravely responsible for recent developments of licence as to marriage, and that the true method of reform lies in the gentle application of ecclesiastical discipline? But does not this suggest another question?

Is not the greatest want of the Church in England to-day: a school of moral and ascetical theology, and the devotion of the priesthood to the study and courageous teaching of its principles? Without this, ecclesiastical discipline must be ineffective. Through this divine science, and its disciplinary use, the grave moral problems of the age will find their solution.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

Pan-Anglican Congress.
Section A.

THE CHURCH AND HUMAN SOCIETY.

MARRIAGE.

THE success of a Congress depends, not only on the expert knowledge and eloquence of the speakers, but also on the general level of intelligence among the audience. Every member of the Congress, by means of some previous study, should be in a position to appreciate the fundamental principles which lie at the root of every Christian discussion, to follow readily the drift of any argument, and to exercise a certain amount of critical judgement in discriminating between rival theories or interpretations.

The Christian Point of View.

(i) In the New Testament the Church is set in contrast to the "world"—i.e. human society in so far as it is organized apart from the recognition of God. But by this very contrast the Church is placed in a special relation to all forms of social activity. All the materials and faculties of human life are meant to serve a Divine purpose. Social usages, commercial methods, political measures—all are capable of becoming ethical forces. For this the Church is responsible, in virtue of her power to regenerate and consecrate all things to the service of God. It is in this sense that we accept the comprehensive words, "All things are yours." The attitude of the Church, then, represents at once a universal claim and a universal obligation. She demands from human society that every department of social life should be brought under the ultimate sway of the Christian law. She also owes to human society the actual presentation in practical life of what the Christian law really means within the sphere of her own freedom.

(ii) The Christian method of social reform is distinguished by the fact that it demands, not conduct merely, but character, and aims at the production of that character by the spiritual agencies of the Church. But there is no necessary antagonism between this essentially Christian method and other methods which depend on the authority and force exercised by the State. The State is regarded as entrusted with the administration of Divine justice, and its officers are "God's ministers", who should "attend continually on this very thing". The Christian citizen, therefore, is morally bound to make full use of his political influence. But here, too, he will be inclined to test all social institutions and forces by their influence on character, and to recognize that in any matter of State action the main question is always—Will it vindicate social justice or increase social efficiency?

REFERENCES.

Watkins. *Holy Matrimony.* (Rivingtons. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Luckock. *The History of Marriage.* (Longmans. 6*s.*)

Stone. *The Law of Christian Marriage, especially in relation to the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act.* (Longmans. 3*d.*)

Lambeth Conference, 1888. *Reports on Purity, Divorce, and Polygamy.* (S.P.C.K. 6*d.*)

Hastings. *Dictionary of the Bible.* Vol. III. Article on "Marriage." (Clark. 28*s.*)

Hall. *The Church's Discipline concerning Marriage and Divorce.* (Longmans. 25 cents.)

Convers. *Marriage and Divorce in the U.S.* (Lippincott. 4*s.* 6*d.*)

Benson. *Christ and His Times.* (Macmillan. 6*s.*)

Westcott. *Social Aspects of Christianity.* (Macmillan. 6*s.*)

Campion. *Lux Mundi.* Essay on "Christianity and Politics." (Murray. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.)